

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

CAROLE HOLLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

PACIFIC RIM CAPITAL ALLIANCE  
CORPORATION, d/b/a/ CHECKMATE and  
DOES 1-10 jointly and severally,

Defendants.

Case No. C 04-5597 JKA

ORDER DENYING MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION  
(Docket #29)

THIS MATTER comes before the court in response to two undated letters addressed to the undersigned, signed by the plaintiff, and filed with the court March 3, 2006 (Doc.29). Although not denominated as such, the court is treating the correspondence as a motion to reconsider the Order Granting Defendants Motion for Summary Judgment dated November 3, 2005 (Doc. 27).

Motions for Reconsideration are governed by Local Rul 7(h) which provides as follows:

**Motions for Reconsideration**

(1) Standard. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

(2) Procedure and Timing. A motion for reconsideration shall be plainly labeled as such. The motion shall be filed within ten judicial days following the order to which it relates. . . . . Failure to comply with this subsection may be grounds for denial of the motion. The pendency of a motion for reconsideration shall not stay discovery or any other procedure.

(3) Response. No response to a motion for reconsideration shall be filed unless requested by the court. No motion for reconsideration will be granted without such a request. . . . .

There is no showing of manifest error in plaintiff's correspondence. There is no offer of new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence. Plaintiff's correspondence is dated three months following the entry of the order granting summary judgment. There is no explanation for the inordinate delay.

1 . Viewed as anything other than a Motion for Reconsideration plaintiff's correspondence (Doc. 29)  
2 does meet the requirements for generating a response. **To the extent plaintiff's correspondence is a Motion**  
3 **for Reconsideration it is denied**  
4

5 March 22, 2006.  
6

7 /s/ J. Kelley Arnold  
8 J. Kelley Arnold  
9 United States Magistrate Judge  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28